U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AU: 2878

EXAMINER'S CASE ACTION WORKSHEET

Application No. 10/073,899				Legal Instrument Examiner	
CHEC	K TYPE OF ACTION				DATE OF COUNT
	Non-Final Rejection		Restriction/Election Only		Final Rejection
	Ex Parte Quayle		Allowance		Advisory Action
	Examiner's Answer		Reply Brief Noted		Non-Entry of Reply Brief
	Defective Notice of Appeal		Interference Disposal SPE(Approval for Disposal)		Suspension (Examiner-Initiated) SPE (initial)
	Defective Appeal Brief		SIR Disposal (use only after FAOM)		Supplemental Examiner's Amendment
	Miscellaneous Office Letter (With Shortened Statutory Period Set)		Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment (With One Month Time Period set)		Miscellaneous Office Letter (No Response Period Set)
	Abandonment after BPAI Decision		Supplemental Action (excluding Examiner's Answer)		Response to Rule 312 Amendment
	Letter Restarting Period for Response (e.g., Missing References)		Interview Summary		Authorization to Change Previous Office Action SPE: (Initial)
	Abandonment		Express Abandonment Date:		Other Specify:

Examiner's Name: Thanh X Luu

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/073,899 SLETTNES, TOR Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Thanh X Luu 2878 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Thanh X Luu. (4)__ . (2) Mark Feldstein. Date of Interview: 16 July 2003. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Kamentsky. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant emphasized how the invention is different from the prior art. Applicant asserted that the term "channel" should be construed in light of the definition found in the specification and that the detectors of the prior art are not integrating detectors. Examiner agreed to take Applicant's remarks into further consideration once a written response is received. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature of required